Appeal: 09-7315 Doc: 24 Filed: 02/09/2010 Pg: 1 of 3

## UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 09-7315

ROY HUNT, JR.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

SANDHIR, M.D., Powhatan Correctional Center; THOMPSON, M.D., Wallens Ridge State Prison; LUCY DOSSETT, M.D., International Radiology Group, LLC; STANFORD, Registered Nurse, Wallens Ridge State Prison; COLLINS, Registered Nurse, Wallens Ridge State Prison; CLARK, Registered Nurse, Wallens Ridge State Prison; BROWN, Correctional Officer Sergeant, Wallens Ridge State Prison; DAVID ROBINSON, Warden, Wallens Ridge State Prison; FRED SCHILLING, Health Service Director; KING, M.D.; A. WARREN,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

JOHN DOE, on 2/23/06 M.D., Powhatan Correctional Center; A. J. UNKNOWN, on 2/2/06, M.D., Powhatan Correctional Center,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Richard L. Williams, Senior District Judge. (3:06-cv-00539-RLW)

Submitted: January 26, 2010 Decided: February 9, 2010

Before WILKINSON, SHEDD, and DAVIS, Circuit Judges.

Appeal: 09-7315 Doc: 24 Filed: 02/09/2010 Pg: 2 of 3

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Roy Hunt, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. Carlene Booth Johnson, PERRY LAW FIRM, PC, Dillwyn, Virginia; Rodney Seth Dillman, HANCOCK, DANIEL, JOHNSON & NAGLE, PC, Virginia Beach, Virginia; Susan Bland Curwood, Assistant Attorney General, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Appeal: 09-7315 Doc: 24 Filed: 02/09/2010 Pg: 3 of 3

## PER CURIAM:

Roy Hunt, Jr., appeals the district court's order denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2006) complaint. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Hunt v. Sandhir, No. 3:06-cv-00539-RLW (E.D. Va. June 30, 2009). We deny Hunt's motions for appointment of counsel and summary disposition. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED